37

A line (one dimension) is included in a rectangle (two dimensions), that is, "area". Area is included in the three-dimensional "volume". Without the concept of "space-time", the form with a volume would not be perceivable. And so "space-time" is the fourth dimension which includes "volume", the mechanism whereby what is objectified becomes perceptible as volume. It is obvious that That which is operating this process of phenomenal manifestation must be a "measurement" (the measurer Itself) beyond the fourth dimension of temporality — which is, of course, Intemporality, which is what-we-are as subjectivity. In other words, the measurer is "I" measuring itself as the volume of the "ten thousand things" in space-time extension through the mechanism of objectification. "Awakening" means the realization that it is Intemporality which manifests as Time or duration in order to make phenomenal objectivization possible, that it is the Nth dimension which includes all the earlier dimensions — and that what-we-are is the subjectivity — "I" — noumenality manifesting Itself as phenomenality through space-time extension.

What the Master says, when he says it, is the spontaneous expression of the instantaneous, absolute or non-phenomenal thought which, if apperceived equally spontaneously by the disciple, retains its pristine purity until it results in some phenomenal reaction from the disciple such as tears of gratitude or something similar. But more often than not, by the time the absolute thought of the Master gets interpreted into dualistic <u>com</u>prehension, it has lost its non-discursive intemporal <u>app</u>rehension in the intervening duration, and has become a concept: an opportunity for "awakening" has been lost. It is for this reason, perhaps, that Nisargadatta Maharaj used to say that whatever people said they had heard from him was not the truth.

The term "noumenon" has to be understood in its context because it may be used either to indicate the non-objective source of all cognition or as the interrelated counterpart of "phenomenon". Actually, the true counterpart of "phenomenon" would be "non-phenomenon", the mutual negation of which would be the conceptual absence of non-phenomenon, that is to say, noumenon.

"Bondage" is bondage from the "me"-concept; and the "me"-concept is entirely dependent on time or duration because the phenomenal identification is essentially an effect of sequential time. As phenomena we are "time", flowing from birth to death, from integration to ultimate disintegration, from appearance to disappearance. Also, quite apart from the validity of the notions of Karma and re-birth, the fact remains that they are temporal phenomena, causal and dependent on sequence of time, and must therefore at once disappear with "awakening" or integration into intemporality.

The phenomenal universe is Noumenon or Intemporality objectively manifest in tri-dimensional volume through the seriality of "time" as duration. Reintegrated, therefore, the phenomenal universe is nothing other than intemporal

---

"Awakening" means waking up from the dream of the seriality of time into the normal state of what-we-are intemporally. But intemporality cannot be conceived because we cannot conceive anything otherwise than in a time-context. Also, that which is objectivizing this phenomenal universe (including, of course, sentient beings) ~~is consciousness~~ from intemporality is consciousness, and consciousness cannot objectivize that from which it is cognizing!

Phenomenal manifestation is an appearance in consciousness, perceived and cognized by consciousness. There is no room really for a perceiver as such. Form is composed of the three directions of measurement constituting volume plus duration, and they are also its perceiving: perceiving is identical with what is perceived. "Things" do not exist as things, they only become apparent — their perceiver is all that they are. The "event" as such is a perceiving of form, and the mechanism of such "event" is measurement ~~of~~ in three directions called "space" together with a fourth called "time". The point is that the perceiving is the totality of the event: its constitution, its appearance, its origin; and its perceiving is the perceived. There is really no room for either a "subject" as a perceiver or an "object" as the perceived. All that happens is a sensorial perceiving — the apparent or phenomenal event — which is an aspect of the noumenality. Nothing phenomenal is separate from the formless noumenon that we are.

Noumenally regarded, phenomenality and its noumenon are not separate. But phenomenally regarded, there is a solution of continuity between them, a continuity to be dissolved in "awakening" when there is a reintegration. What phenomenally appears to be, noumenally is not; and what is noumenally, phenomenally is not — and this must necessarily be so as long as Intemporality manifests as Time.

It is not enough to know that what-we-are is not just an appearance in consciousness, subject to the concept of sequential time. In order to be really liberated, it is vitally necessary to be aware that it is so, while we "live" in ~~a~~ the "flow" ~~~~ of successive temporal moments of the eternal present that is Intemporality.

The sensorial perceiving as such of an apparent phenomenal event is an aspect of the noumenality that we are. Whatever the "form" appears to "perform" are interpretive concepts in duration based on "habit-energy" or memory. They are psychic elaborations (including affective or intellectual manifestations) ~~but they~~ for which nothing additional, fundamentally, is required or produced, and also, their phenomenal expression cannot ever be directly noumenal like the impersonal perceiving which is a subjective functioning.

The psychic elaborations ~~which~~ merely complete the phenomenal picture without adding anything. ~~a~~ An analysis of those psychic elaborations ~~s~~would show that "form" is the perceiving of form; "thinking" is the conceiving of percepts; "acting" is the conating of concepts (mental processes concerning action, including impulse, desire, volition and striving); "events" are the being conscious of conation. It is to be noted that affectivity is inherent in volitional acting just as intellection is inherent in thinking, and that basically there is only perceiving and cognizing, which is the subjective functioning.

42

Any comprehension by the split-mind (divided into subject and object) can only be derivative, temporal and limited. Between ~~the~~ comprehension by the split-mind and apprehension by whole-mind there is a solution of continuity. Whole-mind itself as consciousness is only a concept, for the ~~dissolution~~ dis-solution of which, perfect understanding is necessary. Such perfect understanding can come about only when the visualizing of objects (by the pseudo-~~ob~~subject) ceases, only when thinking takes place from the viewpoint of ~~Totality~~ the functioning of Totality.

The concept of "time" is so much misunderstood that it is important to have a very clear idea of our relation with "time". What-we-are, on the basis of consciousness and its aspect as sentience, is intemporal, and what-we-appear-to-be, the objective appearance, is temporal. What this means is that ~~that~~ if what we represent subjectively is "timeless", then what we think we are objectively and phenomenally must be "time". This may seem startling but nonetheless it is true.

What we think we are is not something stationary but something that is "doing" or "thinking", that is to say, something in action, physically or psychically as psychosomatic apparatus with which most of us are identified. Each apparent action, physical or psychic — volitional action or reaction — is represented by the word Karma. Our phenomenal world is nothing but a composite structure of the totality of such apparent actions, such apparent "events". Such an apparent "event" in order to be phenomenally manifest needs to be extended in space and time. "Time", therefore, is an intrinsic element in the mechanism of manifestation; "time" is ~~and~~ not something outside of us through which we have to pass. We are "time". We are not entities acting in time.

"Time" is, therefore, no thing objective, but merely a concept representing duration, which is necessary for the perceiving of the apparent movements or actions because of which we consider ourselves as the doers and thereby become apparently "bound". The firm conviction that we are Intemporality (and not the unfortunate victims of anything called "Time") means salvation and freedom from time.

Time does not fly. What is fleeting is our sequential living. The word "time" is an objectivization of the subjective Intemporality, an aspect of our conditioned need to affirm ourselves as autonomous subjects of objects functioning in the phenomenal universe. "Time" is an unfortunate invention of the split-mind in order to seek our self-affirmation — and then mourn our "bondage".

Most people, if they were asked what "time" is, would be hard put to give an answer because most people would have only the vaguest notions about "time". Actually, they would be right too, because "time" is only a concept which, together with "space" provides the conceptual basis for the appearance of the phenomenal universe, space providing the volume and time the duration for the universe to be perceived. So far so good. But the problem arises when time is regarded not in its true functional background but as an objective outside factor, to which we and the relevant events are inexorably subjected. actually, there is absolutely no evidence for the existence of any divisions such as past, present and future otherwise than as notional interpretations of the concept of an objective "time" that flows.

The "past" is only a memory, almost invariably distorted and incomplete. The "present" itself is illusive: any event in a time-sequence, supposedly independent of us as observers, has become the past before we could have been aware of it. There is a time-lag between the actual happening of the event and the perceiving and cognizing of it which turns the supposed present into a past. This is because "the complicated process of perception via retina, chemical cellular changes, nerve impulses, further chemical cellular changes in the brain-matter, and psychological interpretation" must necessarily take <u>some</u> time. In other words what is interpreted and recorded as present is no longer a present event — it has already become the past.

We have no option but to accept the conclusion of philosophers during the last two thousand years of conceptual time that "time" is not a thing that could have any objective existence. Why should we therefore not cease to regard "time" as the inexorable devourer of ourselves as entities. And, of course, we cannot do so until we cease to regard ourselves as entities!

"Space" is a concept based on measurement in three directions (length, breadth and height or depth) constituting volume; without volume "space" implies vacuity which is but potential volume. The perceptible universe is thus "composed" of nothing but concepts appearing to produce volume, that is space. If space is static, duration (which is necessary to make the manifested universe perceptible) is the active counterpart of space which measures volume in terms of duration. In other words, duration could be seen as a further spatial measurement which cannot be interpreted by our senses. Indeed many advanced physicists have for some time toyed with the idea concept of "time" as the "fourth dimension of space", and this means that they have been "paddling on the borders of metaphysics." They will have had the right perspective only when they tackle the basic question of where these four measurements could have come, and then come to the conclusion that they must come from only one "centre", and that is the eye that does the measuring, the eye that is everywhere because it is infinity, the eye that is intemporality and therefore is present every moment — in short, the eye that is "I", noumenon, perceiving wherever, whenever, in whatever form "I" may be.

As this-here-now, what each sentient being is, is infinite, intemporal "I" — Presence itself. Inspite of my total objective absence as "I", my presence is as the totality of all phenomenal manifestation. Therefore, why am "I" being sought? Who is there to seek, and who is there to be sought. I am this-here-now, wherever a sentient being appears. Being Infinity, I manifest as space; being Intemporality, I manifest as time. Extended in space and measured in duration, I manifest as each object sensorially perceptible, and each sensorial object appears to function as subject. But it is "I" alone who am subjectivity, and all functioning is my phenomenal objectivization, which is indeed the Consciousness "I Am".

If it is an inescapable fact that no phenomenon can be perceived unless it is extended in space and protracted in duration, and also that space-time are only concepts without any objective ~~extense~~ existence, it must inevitably follow that neither any phenomenon nor its perceiver could ever have any objective existence either, that therefore both perceiver and perceived must be only conceptual, existing only as images in consciousness.

45 This is precisely what the Advaitic doctrine says: objectivity is conceptual; both objects, and their subjects as autonomous entities are totally devoid of any nature or self-hood of their own. It means that all thoughts and all actions which involve spatio-temporal extension are as illusory as a dream. This further means that spatial and temporal extension as ~~a description~~ the mechanism for the manifestation of both the phenomenal perceiver and the perceived, must represent what we are as sentient beings, that is to say, ~~part~~ an essential part of phenomenality which is the objective expression of the unmanifest noumenality.

This should make it clear that it is quite stupid to consider our thoughts and actions as indications of our autonomous individuality, and it should enable us to apprehend the inescapable truth that all phenomenal performance is a play performed by shadows, though, of course, the functioning is always a noumenal aspect. Finally, it should be clear that neither apprehenders nor anything apprehended is anything but phenomenal and therefore conceptual — only the very apprehending is real, and that is what we are.

~~It is not enough to know that what we are~~

The main reason why "Time" continues to be a confused mystery for most people is that even the knowledgeable people have not given up their conditioned technique (because they know no other!) of objectivizing everything they deal with. And "Time" cannot be revealed by any concept.

There is the ~~story~~ well-known story of the sixth Patriarch, then an unknown monk, who found two monks arguing whether it was the wind or the flag that was causing the flapping. "Neither," he said, "it is your mind."

Actually, the nature of "time" is known to us intuitively, and that is why time ~~it~~ is envisaged, whether as a straight line or curved, in terms of a flowing river. And it is obvious that we can be aware of the flow of river only because the apparent experiencer is "outside" ~~time~~. it. In other words, too simple as it might appear, the undeniable fact is that we are experiencing time ~~it~~, from "outside" time, and "outside time" can only mean ~~that~~ Intemporality. Only things, perceived sensorially ~~phenomenally~~ as phenomenal, "flow" in the stream of "time" (including, of course, our phenomenal "selves"), and what-we-are, ~~is~~ that which is perceiving the flow of time, must only be intemporal and immutable. Apperceiving this is "enlightenment".

46 "Time" and phenomena only exist in mind, that is consciousness, as conceptual objectivizations, including our own appearance with which we are unfortunately identified.

Movement of any phenomenon, including of ~~time~~, that of time, can only be "in your mind". The other moving train makes you feel that you are in motion; if both trains are moving at identical speed, no motion will be felt: both events are misconceived in mind. Similarly any correct interpretation of motion or movement is entirely in the mind.

What-we-are as "I" can be stretched to this-here-now, the former two being spatial concepts and the latter temporal. As Intemporality, we can therefore say "I am ~~Now~~ "Now" because "now" is not really subject to time. "Now" is not the present which is gone into the past before we can know it, and which is only a record of what has already been pushed aside by another present. The "present" which is sandwiched between the "past" and the "future" is an illusory representation of "time" which is "horizontal", whereas "now" is timeless and ~~"verticle"~~ "vertical". "Now" is intemporal, eternal.

Dualistic concepts are quite necessary in phenomenality. "I" must necessarily be used in dualistic relation with "you" and "he"; "here" in relation to "there"; "this" in relation to "that"; "now" in relation to "past" and "future". But in using these dualistic concepts, it is essential that we deeply realize ~~(a) that~~ — and never forget — ~~that "that" what which is looking is "I" and when "I" am looking is always "now"; that what is looking is always "this" always from "here", and not "that" from "there"~~ that what is looking is this "I" (not ~~the~~ "that" which is the identified individual), that ~~and~~ when "I" am looking is always "now" (and not the illusory present which has become the past before it is known), that "I" am looking from "here" as the infinite centre and not from a limited centre of "there". Then, we will ~~ap~~ apperceive what-we-are as Infinity (extended in phenomenality as the finite) and Intemporality (protracted in phenomenality ~~is~~ as Time).

People are so intensely conditioned to regard only sensorial experiences as "real" that if you explained to them that what-we-are is intemporal and infinite, and that what we seem to be in temporal volume is merely an appearance, you would be promptly challenged that it is "only a concept". It is found to be extremely difficult to accept that ours is itself a conceptual existence manifested by means of the splitting of intemporal or whole mind into subject and object. Conceptuality is comprehension by means of the comparison of contraries or opposites. The measurements of a form which induces us to accept its reality ~~is~~ are a measurement of "space" (the three-dimensional volume which our senses can interpret) by means of sequential "time".

These measurements of a manifested phenomenon — volume measured in ~~time~~ duration — are certainly a geometrical concept, but the point is that these measurements all arise from one source, one eye, my eye. Always it can only by the eye of "I", whoever says it. And it is everywhere phenomenally, a ubiquitous centre, the centre of infinity (which Ramana Maharshi called "aham-aham", the throbbing "I-I") which is necessarily everywhere phenomenally.

Of course, all this is conceptual, just as everything we say is conceptual, but people are so conditioned to accept conceptual objectivization as something "real" instead of as an appearance in consciousness. The only thing we can "do", apart from silent apprehension (without any conceptual apprehender), is to try to conceptualize in an abstract form. As Huang Po once did. After a brilliant discourse on "Mind", he turned round as he was leaving, and added, "Do not forget, by the way, that there is, of course, no such thing as Mind." Only a few of the many listeners must have understood. But then those were the ones ~~for~~ to whom the discourse was addressed.

Our apparent phenomenal existence is not only not real, but even if it is so regarded, it happens to be strictly restricted to moments or kshana, apparently successive in a ~~time~~-context but actually instantaneous impressions which have neither calculable duration nor any consistence, rather like "stills" in a movie. This fact would seem to make our existence basically not vitally different from a movie, ~~certainly~~ rather "theoretical" and hardly more than a "supposition". ~~As opposed~~

As opposed to such phenomenal living in space-time measurement (which is bondage), there is noumenal living or spontaneous living in an additional dimension representing what one writer (perhaps more) has called "super-volume", ~~if~~ which includes the "volume" of phenomenal living, just as volume includes the "plane-surface". Such noumenal living means living "vertically", at right-angles to the horizontal-living in sequential time, the horizontal stringing together of phenomenal living being cut off at every successive instant, by witnessing each instant, thereby being up-stream of the flow of time.

¶ Continuous witnessing is, in effect, subjective witnessing of the phenomenality itself, in total disidentification because such subjective witnessing presupposes the absence of any judging of the phenomenal event: ~~Without~~ In the absence of judging, the witnessing automatically excludes all involvement, all volition — and, therefore, means freedom from the conceptual bondage.

It is worth considering if the positive approach of Vedanta, that "I am I" (whatever the words or symbols used), somehow makes the task of understanding Truth a little more difficult than the Negative ~~way of~~ approach, that is to say, "I am not me". The emphasis on the personal pronoun "I" in its accepted sense implies an objective self, and this conditioning is so powerful that it does not readily lend itself to the demolition of the "me" in ~~the~~ its transference from phenomenality to noumenality.

The understanding, at least intellectually, would seem to ~~be~~ come more easily if ~~we~~ the emphasis is shifted from the appearance (the "me") which we are not, to the background, the screen on to which phenomenality gets projected, the sub-stance or base on which the appearance arises, which we are. In other words, the understanding could seem simpler if the attention is directed away from some positive action in a time-sequence, on to the aspect of withdrawal into impersonality. In other words, the importance is shifted to the background or sub-stance — that which we are — so that the disappearance of the illusory notion of a "me" would leave the state of affairs as they are and as they always have been: the withdrawal into impersonality and intemporality would lead more directly to the annihilation of the illusion, clearly leaving only the background, the screen the sub-stance which may be called "consciousness" in which the phenomenal manifestation appears. Such "withdrawal" (no "one" withdraws, nothing is actively withdrawn) ~~=~~ involves no action. Indeed such withdrawal means "awakening" to noumenality in the absence of all action which is necessarily phenomenal and temporal.

59

The supposed bondage is really an illusion because there is no thing which can be bound. It would seem therefore that bondage is in fact a "psychic inhibition". Perhaps the single factor which is responsible for this psychic inhibition is the imbalance between the positive and the negative elements which, as duality, the basis for the manifestation, the interrelated polaric opposites. The interrelated opposites positive or male and negative or female are the more fundamental of these opposites or contraries. The condition one receives from birth has always been heavily weighted in favour of the positive, resulting in an imbalance which is not even recognized as such.

Obviously, therefore, it is the restoration of the balance or equilibrium between the yin (female) and the yang (male), the negative and the positive, which is perhaps the one single factor which brings about the sudden awakening or enlightenment or the liberation from the supposed bondage. The basis of duality, the pair of opposites "me" and the "not-me", is very much a part of the imbalance, and therefore any positive action on the part of the "me" (the positive factor) in order to restore the imbalance (as recommended so widely by most organized traditional religions) seems on the face it ununderstandable. Perhaps this is the reason that traditional religion does not really aim at the highest point but is satisfied to remain at the socio-economic level of trying to make people live with one another in reasonable amity.

The only other way consists in the systematic negation of all psychic activity — all thought, necessarily based on the "me" concept — thereby rectifying the imbalance holding us in bondage.

It is not often remembered that phenomenal manifestation — the arising of objectified phenomenality in or upon the subjective noumenality — is a positive factor, and there is a solution of continuity between phenomenality, {based on the duality of positive and negative}, and noumenality which is ~~neig~~ neither (because it is prior to the very concept of positive/negative). Therefore what is necessary, in order to <u>be</u> the noumenality, is the dis-solution of the interdependent counterparts, positive and negative; and this dis-solution is brought about only by the mutual negation of the opposites by their <u>accurate</u> superimposition through perfect equilibrium, like the superimposition of positive and negative films resulting in a photograph, with light and shade (the contrasting elements) <u>eliminating each other</u> because they are in perfect equilibrium. This perfect equilibrium results in phenomenality ~~action~~ when ~~in~~ all action has become spontaneous, noumenal action through non-objective perceiving, without volition ~~nor~~ or choice exercised by any supposed autonomous entity.

Such elimination of all interdependent opposites through mutual negation results in a <u>phenomenal</u> blank or void which is the total absence of conceptual objects; ~~But such phenomenal void~~ conceptuality is thereby annihilated ~~Conceptuali~~ along with its very basis, the "me" concept, and the split-mind of phenomenal duality and dualism is rendered "whole". What ~~is~~ phenomenally results as "void" is in fact the fullness, the plenum, the total potentiality of ~~the~~ Noumenon which is what-we-are, and have always been, ~~but~~ which cannot be conceived because it is That itself which is conceiving.

The only and apparent existence of phenomenal objectivization, as presence, is in Consciousness, manifested by the mechanism of the duality of ~~subject~~ the supposed subjects and their objects. The elimination of the inferred subject/object relation removes the duality and thus the supposed "reality" of the phenomenal universe. In other words, it is only by negating positive conceptuality that duality can be transcended, and impersonality (disidentification from a supposed autonomous entity) reached.

In order that I may be aware of That-which-I-am, I must necessarily cease to be conscious of this-which-I-am-not. Throughout phenomenal activity, positivity invariably means ~~affirmation~~ constant affirmation of the "self" or "me", and it is only negativity which can bring about the constant negation of the "me". It is only when negativity is brought into equilibrium with positivity (which is the prevailing factor in our conditioning) that they mutually compensate each other and result into the voidness of both positive and negative objectivity and the annihilation of the ego-sense which means liberation.

Just as negativity achieved would lead to the devil as the unholy monster — the "anti-Christ" — positivity achieved could lead to "an affective phenomenon such as that holy monster (etymologically) a saint." It is only equilibrium which would lead to a "sage", the perfection of noumenal normality.

The absence of the phenomenal "me" means the presence of the noumenal what-you-are; and "enlightenment" means living noumenally, living as what-you-are.

5/

The "reality" of any object — as near as a chair or as distant as a star — is nothing but an image in consciousness. An object is "sensed" or perceived in mind (which is the content of ~~mind~~ consciousness) because of an impression which gathers body and form by extremely rapid repetitions. Each repetition is a separate quanta, and a series of such quanta constitutes what is known as "Time". Therefore, what we imagine as the reality of an object is nothing but a continuous series of impressions in a succession of quantas, and the basis of the manifestation of objects as well as the "time" in which the phenomenal objectivization takes place is Consciousness. All so-called "reality" is thus conceptual and phenomenal, an appearance in Consciousness. It is only by the negation of this imaginary reality that we can apprehend Noumenality which is the true Reality that we are.

This has the validity, one believes, of physics. Science says that the experience of seeing a star gets repeated in our minds through so many quanta, and this means that the distance, the velocity and the light itself are all found to be in our own mind. And so all phenomena are totally conceptual and have no nature of their own even to be called "things".

If all perception is thus through quanta in mind or consciousness, "motion" would clearly be only a relation between two objects (one a supposed subject and the other its object) and, therefore, movement or motion as such being a succession of quanta in mind or consciousness. In other words, clearly, in the absence of anything real, space-time can only be an aspect of consciousness with which we identify ourselves as supposed individual entities.

If people are told that there is no "self", they would laugh at the idea and consider you a great humourist. This is because they are conditioned to imagine self as an object. ~~and~~ Seeing that self cannot be an object is inseeing whereas the outseeing to which people are conditioned is outseeing. But the fact is that you cannot actually even think of what you are, because you can only think of an object, and you that is thinking is subject. How can thinking think of what is thinking? When thinking, perceiving, cognizing, you are not an objective image in mind — you are the thinking, perceiving, cognizing. Self cannot be thought of as an object because "it" is what is thinking that thought, and an object cannot be its own subject.

52 Anything one sees must necessarily be an object. The point is that "Self" (with a capital "S") is what looks, the perennial subject, and it cannot be a plural like my self and your self. All there is phenomenally is a functioning. There is only one functioning and it is no "one". It is not eternal either because there is no "It" to be eternal or not-eternal, temporal or intemporal, finite or in-finite. But what they are is what "it" is, and what "it" is — we are.

There is no such object as "you" or "me" however "solid" it may appear, because there is neither ~~no~~ space nor time except as the conceptual extension for images in consciousness, images of what we are as Self, objectified as what we appear to be, and conditioned to believe as ~~what~~ "ourselves" and everything that we cognize. All is "dreamed-stuff", as the Buddha is supposed to have said

---

Religion is both a Way and an obstacle. As a Way, religion is traditional. What all the teachers have taught and what all the Prophets have "seen" cannot but be basically the same, but they have expressed it ~~to suit~~ in accordance with the mental conditioning of those among whom they lived and for the benefit of whom they preached it. And therefore the teachings in their respective expressions differed from one another chronologically and geographically. Religion can be an obstacle to a true understanding of what-we-are because devotion demanded by traditional religion is positive and emotional, and like intellectuality, affectivity can be a great obstacle. What intellectuality and affectivity both do is to turn outward towards an Object (however holy it may be ~~considered~~ conceived), towards objectification of thought. This means that both turn away from ourselves, the true "Within" of Jesus.

Both dialectics and affectivity are thus positive and outflowing whereas it is only through constant and total negation of all that is positive and phenomenal, of all conceptual supposed "reality", that noumenality, the Reality that we are, can be clearly apprehended.

Such clear apprehension of what-we-are is the sudden enlightenment that the Masters have spoken about. The apprehension of what-we-are comports, of course, the apprehension of what-we-are-not. But this apperception can be said to be perfect understanding when the apperception gets translated into the living of what has been understood, into spontaneous or noumenal living. This is no doubt what the Master Huang Po meant when he said that "awakening" or "enlightenment" must necessarily be sudden (because otherwise it would be temporal understanding by the split-mind) although the "deliverance" may be gradual.

Whatever is sensorially perceivable is like the wrapper of the real thing, a sample, a description, a Greek mask — like a police constable representing the ~~Inspector~~ Director General of Police, a civil servant representing the Government, like the tip of an iceberg indicating the bulk underneath. Thus whatever is sensorially perceivable, the positive which seems real is only the outward appearance of what lies underneath.

The presence is thus merely the appearance of what is absent. The phenomenally manifested presence is merely the outward appearance of the noumenal absence, the source of the manifested phenomena. Noumenal presence is phenomenal absence. Reality, therefore, is not the positive but the negative, not the outward appearance but the potential source of the appearance, not the known but the unknowable potential.

What we truly are is that type of absence which is neither presence nor absence, which comports the absence of both positive and negative suffering, the latter being the sort of suffering which, because of the sheer habit of it, is not recognized as such. One ~~is~~ may be clearly afraid of "dying", but phenomenal "living" also, because of the mnemonic past and the unknown future, could well be a sort of negative suffering. Absolute absence means absence of positive pleasure which is only the interrelated polaric counterpart of positive suffering, and therefore the absence of both indicates a sort of phenomenal void which is really the fullness of plenum. Such a concept is not generally acceptable as our normal true state because it induces a sense of fear, of loneliness, perhaps not unlike that of a forgotten astronaut in continuous, solitary orbit. It is perhaps in order to provide a "security blanket" against such fears that Vedanta provides a term like <u>sat-chit-ananda</u>, although the very acceptance of such a security blanket means the confession of not being prepared to give up the infamous identification as a separate entity. In the absolute absence of noumenality who could be there to feel any loneliness or anything? And with what instrument will he feel anything? Was there any feeling of loneliness or anything else in deep sleep? Quite clearly, there cannot be positive ~~joy~~ pleasure if there is no positive suffering, but the removal of both and the restoring of a norm, unknown to us in phenomenal living, which could well be imagined as serenity, but the fact remains that absolute absence presupposes the absence of self and the presence of consciousness not aware of itself.

The question of bondage is inextricably involved with "time" because it is the happening of an event and its interpretation by the supposed individual which brings about the concept of "bondage". If there is no event — as in deep sleep or under sedation — there is no existence, indeed no need, of time or space in which the event could take place.

The event "occurs" only in the mind of the perceiver, the mind being the content of consciousness, and any event is only a psychic experience, a recording in memory when it ~~is~~ becomes known. Thus whether they are current events or memories of events, they are only objectivizations in consciousness; and it does not need to be specifically stated that, therefore, all the "characters" concerned in the event must necessarily also be only objectivizations

---

Those sentient objects who have understood by means of their psychic mechanism called "mind-~~intellect~~ intellect" that they are nothing but noumenon in phenomenal manifestation, may not necessarily be able to "live" that understanding in actual life. In order to be able to do that, there has to be an "adjustment" through which they have de-phenomenalized themselves and disidentified their supposed individual subjectivity from an imagined selfhood as the "me".

Such an adjustment is not really an event or an experience but essentially a sudden realization that the assumption of subjectivity by a phenomenal object was an utter illusion, that the only subject is ~~the~~ "I", noumenon, which is his true identity and not the figmentary "me". Such a transformation — a <u>metanoesis</u> — means in effect ~~the~~ shedding the confinement of sensorial perception and suppositional "volition", and awakening into "the impersonal infinitude of noumenality" in which all problems of phenomenal life are found to have disappeared.

Living for the ordinary man is really nothing but the continual process of objectifying, and this process never stops except in the state of deep, dreamless sleep. Phenomenal life in an apparent universe is just objectivization, and indeed, that is precisely what manifestation is: when objectifying ceases as in the state of deep sleep or under sedation, there is no more objective universe.

When objectivization ceases, the manifested universe is not, but we are. The apparent universe and what-we-are are truly not different. They are not two (or, truly, not even "one"); they are dual only in presence, but non-dual in absence, apparently severed in manifestation but not without a solution of continuity between them.

Despite the apparent difficulty of accepting it as such, the fact remains that the sentient being is objectively only a dreamed figure, a phantom; and therefore, whatever he seems to be doing can only be conceptual. What is apparently "done", by the psychosomatic mechanism, is merely the production of illusory images and their interpretations. All phenomenal existence, therefore, indeed all the characteristics of human beings — form, perceiving, conceiving, willing, knowing — are figments, creations of consciousness (mind) which itself, as such, is only hypothetical.

Consciousness divides itself, for the purpose of manifestation, into two aspects: the perceiving division of mind in its subjective aspect, and the perceived division of mind in its objective aspect; we are the former, we appear to be the latter, but they are inseparable in the absence of manifestation.

Sentient beings dream the universe by objectivizing it as the subjective aspect of consciousness, which is all that they are.

There is no one to "see" and no "thing" to be "seen" — there is only seeing which is (the subjective aspect of) Noumenon. In fact noumenon and phenomena are themselves concepts of the divided mind in manifestation. Phenomena are noumenon objectifying itself and Noumenon is subject objectifying itself as phenomena — an actor appearing in the role and costume of, say, a king. The actor is absent when the "king" is present and when the "king" is absent, the actor is present. "It" (noumenon unconceived as the interrelated opposite of phenomena) is the absolute phenomenal absence and the absence of that concept of "absence", that is to say, absolute presence (what the "actor" remains when the question of acting is irrelevant).

It is important to understand very clearly that sentient beings as such have nothing at all to do with the arising of the phenomenal manifestation. The psychosomatic apparatus of the sentient being is as much a phenomenon in the manifestation as any other objectivized phenomena. It is ~~their~~ sentience, the perceptive aspect of consciousness, with which the "sentient beings" are endowed, which is responsible for the perceiving, ~~and~~ cognizing and interpreting the "other" phenomena. ~~While~~ If the appearance of the psychosomatic body is the static aspect of all phenomena in the manifestation, sentience would be the dynamic aspect by means of which the cognitive faculties interpret such manifestation.

In other words, as objective phenomena there is no difference between animate objects and inanimate objects; the difference arises ~~through~~ because of the subjective non-apparent sentience which is responsible for perception.

If this position is deeply and intensively understood, the sentient beings would perhaps be inclined to give up their identification as individual superior beings phenomenally, and recognize their true identity as the noumenal non-manifestation.

The practice of non-practice or noumenal living (without the constant pressure of phenomenal living) is to place the responsibility for all happenings precisely where it belongs, never to forget that total responsibility lies not on the objects (because they just do not exist as such) but squarely on their subject, the consciousness in which the total manifestation has appeared and which cognizes all ~~the~~ phenomena through its perceptive aspect known as sentience — Where is the knowledge of all phenomena and what cause them to be known?: Where is the flag flapping and what causes it to flap; Where is the ~~cow~~ church-bell singing and what causes it to sing?; where is the flavour of the fruit and what gives it that flavour?; Where is the scent of the rose and what causes it to smell so sweet? Where is the shoe pinching and what causes it to pinch?

Consciousness, of course, in its various subjective aspects.

Nobody believes that he does not exist. No one has ever believed or will ever believe that he does not exist.

This is so because there is no entity to believe that he does not exist. If there were any entity to believe that he did not exist, how could its existence be denied?

The actual position is that he neither exists, nor does he not exist. What he is is the absence of that which he is not! Would it be better understood with the explanation that there is a solution of continuity between what he is and the concept of "existing/not-existing" (like that between the moon and the concept of its reflection). This is so because noumenon and phenomenon are inseparably separate when conceived in manifestation, unconceived they are totally inseparable.

Never has the Truth been so well put from the viewpoint of the individual as by the Sixth Patriarch Fung Yu-lan when he said, "When a man as a subject and its object are eliminated then he is one with 'non-being', and is described as having silent identification with non-being; and by that is meant that not merely the man knows there is non-being but that he is actually identified with non-being."

There is one single factor which prevents our knowing That and that alone which we are, which prevents our being it (though we are it), which prevents our living it through our phenomenal manifestation. It is our identification as a pseudo-subject of pseudo-objects, the subjective illusion based on separate individuality, an ego or will-body operating through supposed volition. This can never be annihilated directly, positively, because the ego cannot be expected to annihilate itself! The only way is the negative way: to destroy the concept of the object as a thing-in-itself.

To realize that objects are only known or cognized only through reactions of the senses of ~~the~~ sentient beings to a variety of stimuli is to realize that objects have no demonstrable existence apart from the subject which cognizes them. And since subject is itself not sensorially cognizable as an object, both subject and object can only be inferences in consciousness, which itself can only be a conceptual assumption without any demonstrable existence. When the mind is thus thrown back, turned away from objectifying, and returned to its source, its true ~~cen~~ subjective centre, both objects and their subject are annihilated together, and the subjective illusion is eliminated.

It is necessary to understand that all attempts by analogies can be misleading inasmuch as it is obviously futile to represent by concepts and objective images (like the clay and the pot, or the gold and the ornament) "That" whose basic nature is non-nature, whose sole being is non-being, whose presence is the absolute absence of both objectivity and non-objectivity.

We are inclined to think that with the disposal of the pseudo-subject "who", a solid objective universe, apart from the apparent defection of our precious selves, would remain complete in all other respects.

It is necessary to realize well and truly each and every ~~self~~ supposed self shares the fate of its subject — whatever that fate may be — because anything sensorially perceived and cognized with his objective appearance is phenomenally integral with that. In other words, wherever there is an objective "who", there will also be found an objective "where" and an objective "when". But, on the other hand, in the absence of the "who", the others will also be absent. When the identification with an object is destroyed, the resultant liberation is from "who", "where" and "when", from all problems

~~51~~ But since the phenomenal "who" does not disappear as an appearance when identification is destroyed, nor does the phenomenal universe. The spectacle goes on and so also the phenomenal "subject", however wide awake he may be. But for the awakened one, although he continues to use the terms "who" "where" and "when", they are meaningless to him. So also is the term "others" meaningless to him, ~~but~~ and his living ~~is a~~ becomes a continuous natural urge to bring about among the "others", "wherever" and "whenever" feasible, the same understanding of the ~~fictitious~~ illusory nature of what they believe to be genuine and of the genuine nature of what they ~~not~~ believe to be illusory.

To think of ~~that~~ this-which-we-are-not is not enough, ~~as~~ it is necessary not to think of it, in ~~so~~ order that That-which-we-are shall act directly. Direct action, like direct seeing, ~~as~~ does not know "volition" and is anterior to mediate, discriminating thought.

Any act is phenomenal and therefore phenomena cannot act upon noumenon; an appearance cannot affect the source of its appearance; a shadow cannot act on its substance.

All apparent *action*, all apparent practice, necessarily has its source in noumenon. Thus, it noumenon alone that "practises" and phenomena are "practised". Who then practises — to what end?

Objectively separated as appearance, as what they are not, practiser and practised are noumenally inseparable as what ~~s~~ they are. There is nothing to practise and there is no practiser.

The concept of opposites ~~or contraries~~ is an effect of the concepts of space and time. Phenomenal extension in space results in the contraries like long and short, left and right, up and down; phenomenal extension in time (duration) results in contraries like early and late, before and after, fast and slow.

It is from the concept of space-time that interdependent counterparts arise, such as subject and object, positive and negative, *purusha* and *prakriti*, *yin* and *yang* — ~~altern~~ separate in space and alternating in time.

60 None of these opposites, nor ~~the~~ any of the complementary elements, has any existence other than conceptual, and are returned to their source through their resolution. When superimposed (like the negative and positive of a photographic plate) each element cancels the other in each pair of concepts, resulting ~~in~~ *phenomenally* in a "blank" or "void", but *noumenally* in the fullness of plenum, which is total absence ~~of~~ as phenomenon (which is the same as total presence as noumenon).

This is the dissolution of duality, the subsuming of objectivity and the assuming of subjectivity, resulting in the ~~cancelling~~ substitution of automatic interpretive objectivization by direct non-volitional apperceiving.

If it is accepted (as truth) that the sentient being is merely an appearance in consciousness and that noumenality is his primal nature, it must surely follow that any belief in any action (any practice, any discipline) means turning one's back on the truth. The fact of the matter is that "enlightenment" is the natural state of every human being, wherein there is no separate identity at all. It is therefore a state which cannot be recognized so long as there is an individual considering himself to be a separate autonomous entity capable of achieving that state.

Therefore, any kind of volitional practice or intentional procedure must necessarily be an insurmountable obstruction to the occurrence of "enlightenment".

Whatever is observed is appearance, its observer is the counterpart, both being objects as dual aspects of manifesting consciousness, but both are the noumenal subject when unmanifested.

Noumenon is consciousness, phenomenon an appearance in consciousness. Manifested we are appearance, unmanifested we are noumenon

---

Knowing that the observer and the observed have no existence, conceptual in any case, apart from each other, and knowing that all there is, is the subjective functioning of observing, divided mind is rejoined in its wholeness and holiness.

When the impersonal consciousness comes into manifestation by objectifying itself as subject and object, it happens to identify itself with each sentient object, and at once the concept of a separate autonomous entity as "me" arises in human beings. This "me"-concept sees the phenomenal world as "real" and itself as the subject of the other objects in the world. This assuming of the noumenal subjectivity by the "me"-concept is what constitutes the conceptual bondage. The liberation from this conceptual bondage is awakening to the knowledge that what-we-are is this animating consciousness, that is noumenon, which is common to all ~~hum~~ sentient beings and not the phenomenal objects (the "me"s) to which it gives sentience.

If it is clearly understood that the "me" who is supposedly in bondage simply does not exist except as a mere concept without any nature of its own, then it would also be understood that ~~then~~ the "bondage", which the "me"-concept is supposed to be suffering from, cannot also be anything other than a mere concept. And then the whole conceptual structure of the bondage-enlightenment illusion disappears into thin air.

The entire manifested phenomenal universe is an objectivization in consciousness; all objectivization is conceptual and all conceptuality is unreal, an illusion, an inference. Therefore there cannot any truth regarding an illusion; there cannot be any of the interrelated concepts like ignorance and knowledge, bondage and ignorance, positive and negative. All there is, is absolute absence of anything cognizable, which at once is absolute presence of the unknowable noumenon.

Phenomena are not something projected by noumenon. They are the appearance of noumenon, noumenon rendered objective and apparent. Noumenon, as subject, objectivizes itself as ~~object~~ appearance, manifesting phenomenally within itself, and thus the phenomenal universe becomes the objective aspect of noumenon. Objectivization is a process of exteriorization: noumenon becomes apparent to itself as object — it looks at itself and perceives the universe, which then is apparently outside itself, ~~conceived~~ in space and ~~during~~ duration, without extension in which objects could not be cognized.

6/ That functioning is what sentient beings are, and ~~this~~ this extension in space-time is what we appear to be in the totality of manifestation. In this manifestation, as phenomena, we have no nature of our own, but that functioning is our nature, in which phenomenality and noumenality are identical. No individual entity is anywhere involved in this functioning. And when the autonomous functioning (what-we-are in manifestation) ceases to function by withdrawing itself from an apparent space-time continuum, there is total integration in noumenality.

In all forms of advaita (non-duality) the ultimate question is "Who (or what) am I?" There can never be an answer, the purpose of the question being only to turn the mind inward. The term "me" in reference to the name and form of a supposed entity is merely a "colloquial convention", a concept. The absolute absence (absence of both presence and absence) of "me-ness" is all that I can be conceptually. But it can be ~~apprehended~~ realized non-conceptually not in thought which is knowledge (the counterpart of ignorance) but in non-thought or spontaneous awareness that is not aware of being aware, an awareness prior to conceptualizing.

The principle of causation — the process of cause-effect, is dependent on duration and is necessarily phenomenal, so that every phenomenon must also necessarily be dependent on temporal causation. This means that no volitional element can interfere with the operation of this process, and obviously within that process there cannot be any entity to exercise freedom of will.

It is impossible to imagine each objective entity operating subjectively with freedom of will, introducing of new causes into the apparently inexorable chain of causation. The idea of karma is really based not on the supposed will introducing a new cause to produce a different effect, but on the psychic impulsion conceptualized as "will" or intention expressed as "volition" thereby producing either fulfilment or frustration depending on the event which ~~would~~ must take place (or not take place). Such fulfilment or frustration depending upon the actual event can, of course, only be a psychological phenomena, which may well be a cause for a future event.

63

The dream is not in any degree dependent on the dreamed characters. Our dreamed "selves" can be seen in awakened retrospect to have been not autonomous entities as they appeared in the dream but mere puppets. Such is also our apparent life in this apparent universe: they who think they are acting and living autonomously are really being dreamed in their totality, activated completely as puppets are activated by the puppeteer.

All this which is dreamed is nothing but the dreaming mind within the consciousness in which it occurs, a product of the subject-object process called causation, ~~in fact~~ integral in consciousness, indeed consciousness itself, which is what-we-are. But, never must it be forgotten that "consciousness" as such, is not a "thing" but only a concept, representing unmanifest noumenon. Thus, all the elements in either dream are whatever their dreamer is, phenomenally nothing, noumenally everything.

All there *is*, is "I", totally devoid of identity or attribute. A mere thought of "me" is immediate bondage. Every human being *knows* this and is free to become aware of it and to "live" by this awareness.

Every volitional "act", whether it be reading, chanting or listening or arguing etc. would necessarily reinforce thought which constitutes "bondage". Other than being aware of this (which is already known) and consciously living this which is already being lived, all else is appearance and "bondage".

I am neither entity nor non-entity but the absence of ~~th~~ ~~negative~~ non-entity (the negative of entity). I am the source of all thoughts but not the thinker of any thoughts. I am the source of all doing but not the performer of any act.

Has this been understood? Then the words must be immediately forgotten and dissolved in the phenomenal void resulting ~~of non-duality~~ from the resolution of duality.

64

The whole problem about the quest is that there is a "seeker". The "seeker" is still an identity and an identity cannot find its own absence any more than a shadow can find its own substance. It is vain for a self-anchored phenomenon, an object, to seek the Subject which it is. It is only the subject who could seek and then, what he will find is his own absence precisely like light cannot find itself, only the absense of itself.

In the abandoning of all questing, the questor disappears, and in that disappearance is apprehended what the questor has been all along. It is only ~~in~~ the total absence of practice and non-practice, when there is no individual practiser, which could make possible the awakening to ~~the~~ state of enlightenment.

The concept of "enlightenment" as made applicable to an individual is a colossal nonsense, because the term denotes a state with which an individual entity is wholly incompatible.

In fact the idea of achieving enlightenment implies that that is not the normal condition of the sentient being. Quite the contrary is the fact. The absence of the normal condition of enlightenment is the <u>current</u> condition of a phenomenal sentient being, because phenomenality is nothing but the arising of an eclipse on noumenality. The disappearance of that eclipse means ~~the~~ at once the disappearance of phenomenality (~~altog~~ appearing as something real) and the revelation or the emergence of the normal ~~condition~~ state of noumenality.

"Enlightenment" is the name given to the state of universality into which the pseudo-identity awakens when the illusion of autonomy has disappeared and the individual entity has been ~~ann~~ annihilated.